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Committee for the Re-election of the President

MEMORANDUM

May 11, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE HONORABLE JOHN N. MITCHELL
FROM: ROBERT M. TEETER
SUBJECT: Second Wave Polling

The purpose of this memorandum is to recommend the design of our second wave polling and to get your approval of the basic design so I can begin to work with the vendors on questionnaire design and specific cost estimates.

Purpose

The purpose of this wave of polling will be to update our polling information in the priority states after all the major Presidential Primaries are over and after perception of the potential Democratic candidates is better defined. The Primaries and national events have undoubtedly changed public opinion in several important areas since January, and we need current polling data to reevaluate our position in each of the priority states, to further define our national campaign plan, and to develop individual state campaign plans.

This set of polls will allow us to identify changes in the various candidates ballot strength or perception or in the basic issue structure since January. It will also allow us to begin to develop some trend lines on both the candidates and issues for the campaign.

Some of the major areas I think should be covered on this wave are:

- Secret ballot measurement of the President vs. Humphrey, McGovern, and Kennedy with and without Wallace
- Ballot effect of various potential Vice-Presidential candidates
- Perception of the major candidates
  - Familiarity/amount of knowledge of the candidates
  - Approval rating/why
  - Personal perception data
- Measurement of core pro and anti Nixon vote
National issue structure
Rating of intensity of issue concern
Rating of candidates ability to handle major issues
Perception of whether a problem has gotten better or worse under the Nixon administration
Attitudes toward specific national problems
  Tax reform/VAT
  National defense
  Status and attitudes toward police
  Attitudes toward Congress
  Attitudes toward trade unions/George Meany
  Attitudes toward Phase II
  Marijuana/Drugs
  Farm problems
  Women's issues

This data would all be tabulated and analyzed by past voting behavior, by current voting intention, by degree of commitment for or against the President, by geographic regions, and by the various demographic groups. These are essentially the same breaks that we used in Wave I and would allow us to identify any specific changes in the President's strength since January. The data from this wave would also be run by Area of Dominant Influence (ADI) which would allow the advertising people to use the data more effectively by relating it to the major media markets.

Design

I think we should divide the states to be polled into two groups on this wave and do a fairly long interview designed to get in-depth data on the candidates and issues only in the top priority states and do a much shorter (and less expensive) interview designed to get the basic head-to-head and issue data in the other states.

The states I recommend we do in June are:

Long Interview
  California
  Texas
  Illinois
  Ohio
  New Jersey
  New York

Short Interview

Alabama /
Pennsylvania /
Maryland /
Michigan /
Connecticut /
Washington /
Wisconsin /
Missouri /
Oregon /
West Virginia /
Indiana /

While Indiana and Alabama think we ought to check Illinois and we should survey Alabama strength in one of the deep south states simply on the basis that we do not have a basis to check Indiana with Red Blount.

Timing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approval of basis</td>
<td>May 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of questionaire and design</td>
<td>May 16-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final approval of questionaire and design</td>
<td>May 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewing</td>
<td>June 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary reports</td>
<td>June 15-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final reports</td>
<td>July 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final reports</td>
<td>July 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cost

The approximate cost of this study does not, however, preclude any shared cost negotiations with individual states. The shared cost arrangement among Illinois, Indiana, Texas, and Oklahoma in Pennsylvania, Ohio, possibly Washington, and Connecticut. The final cost would be decided in an exact cost estimated will be finalized and will be submitted for approval. 

Recommendation: That you prepare a list of states to be polled. The questionnaire and design for approval by May 30.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approve</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>